

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **27 July 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-30. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi (USPub 2003/0039455, hereinafter “Ouchi”) in view of Robertson et al (USPN 5,857,042 hereinafter “Robertson”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Robertson. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Ouchi and Robertson teaches providing a **single** transmitting transducer element and a **single** receiving transducer element **for each channel** (see Ouchi, FIGs. 6A-6F, Ouchi paragraphs [0090]-[0093], Robertson, Fig. 3, and Robertson, col. 4, lines 1-54).

In contrast, the present invention provides **multiple** transducer elements **for each channel** (see FIG. 4 and paragraphs [0037] and [0040] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides necessary signals to correct misalignments between the chips. There is nothing within Ouchi or Robertson, either separately or in concert, which suggests providing multiple transducer elements for each channel.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention provides multiple transducer elements for each channel. These amendments find support in FIG. 4 and in paragraphs [0037] and [0040] of the instant application. Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to remove limitations added in the previous amendment. Dependent claims 6, 16, and 26 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 4-8, 17-18, and 27-28 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.


New dependent claims 31-33 have been added to restore original dependent claims 5, 15, and 25, respectively.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4, 7-10, and 31, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-14, 17-20, and 32, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-24, 27-30, and, 33 which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 9 August 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com